Attorney Docket No. 052684

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 15 and 17 have been amended.

No new matter has been added. Claims 21-50 were canceled. In light of the foregoing

amendments and the following remarks, Applicants earnestly solicit favorable consideration.

Claims 1-20 had been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipate by EP 1 085

586.

Applicants respectfully submit this rejection is improper.

In response to the arguments submitted on June 1, 2007, the Examiner remains

unconvinced as indicated in the Final Office Action.

Regarding Applicants' first argument, that *Inomata* does not disclose "a first magnetic

layer and a second magnetic layer having different magnitudes of magnetization," the Examiner

states that this feature is in fact disclosed in paragraphs 58 and 47 of *Inomata*. Here *Inomata* 

discloses that "the two ferromagnetic layers forming the three-layered film are made to have a

different thickness from each other."

The Examiner states, "Inomata discloses that the layers may be of different thicknesses,

which creates a different magnitude of the magnetic layers in accordance with the instant

specification." Emphasis added. Applicants' respectfully submit that the Examiner's language

Application No. 10/538,689

Attorney Docket No. 052684

Independent claims 1 and 7 each require "different magnitudes of here is imprecise.

magnetization." Emphasis added.

The Examiner appears to imply that having a different thickness of a ferromagnetic layer

means having a different magnitude of magnetization. Applicants respectfully submit that the

Examiner's position is incorrect. Having a thicker ferromagnet will not increase the magnitude

of the magnetization. It may increase the magnetic field, but this is not what is being claimed.

Applicants submit that a magnitude of magnetization will vary depending on, for example

a charge or current density. In other words, the higher the charge (or current) density of a

material, the more magnetized the material will be. Thus when Inomata discloses a different

thickness for a particular ferromagnetic layer, the magnitude of magnetization will not change.

The charge density of the ferromagnetic layer will remain the same. As discussed earlier, this

may increase the magnetic field, but not the magnitude of magnetization.

This is also evidenced by formula (2) on page 16 where H represents a magnetic field and

M represents magnetization. Thus the magnitude of magnetization is not the same as the strength

of a magnetic field.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not disclose or fairly

suggest the claimed feature.

Application No. 10/538,689

Attorney Docket No. 052684

In addition to the arguments presented above, Applicants have amended the claims to

further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art.

Independent Claim 1:

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to require in part:

said first magnetic layer of SyAF and said injection junction part are bonded, and

a spin polarization electron is injected from said spin injection part by flowing electric

current between said spin polarizing part and said second magnetic layer, and magnetization of

said first and second magnetic layers is reversed while maintained in antiparallel state without

applying an external magnetic field.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above recited requirements of claim 1 are not

disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited reference. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 and

its dependent claim are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 7:

Applicants have amended independent claim 7 to require in part:

the magnetization of said first and second magnetic layers is reversed by flowing electric current

between said second magnetic layer of the free layer and said ferromagnetic fixed layer while

maintained in an antiparallel state without applying an external magnetic field.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above recited requirements of claim 7 are not

disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited reference. As such, Applicants submit that claim 7 and

its dependent claim are in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/538,689

Attorney Docket No. 052684

Independent Claim 15:

Applicants have amended independent claim 7 to require in part:

the magnetization of said ferromagnetic free layer is reversed by flowing electric current between

the spin polarization part and said nonmagnetic layer provided on the surface of said ferromagnetic

free layer in the direction perpendicular to the film surface without applying an external magnetic

field.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above recited requirements of claim 15 are not

disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited reference. As such, Applicants submit that claim 15

and its dependent claim are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 17:

Applicants have amended independent claim 17 to require in part:

the magnetization of said ferromagnetic free layer is reversed by flowing electric current between

the spin polarization part and the ferromagnetic fixed layer provided on the surface of said

ferromagnetic free layer in the direction perpendicular to the film surface without applying external

magnetic field

Applicants respectfully submit that the above recited requirements of claim 17 are not

disclosed or fairly suggested by the cited reference. As such, Applicants submit that claim 17

and its dependent claim are in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/538,689 Attorney Docket No. 052684

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

Dennis M. Hurbs

Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 59,145

Telephone: (202) 822-1100 Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SGA/DMH/klf